

Col No	Road Ref.	Beaumont Avenue Comments	Council Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Beaumont Avenue	We have received your letter of the 2nd February regarding the change to the planned restrictions for Beaumont Avenue under ref Yel1-11/2022. Living at 78 Beaumont Avenue we were one of the supporters of the original scheme since we suffer from not having an adjoining driveway with our neighbour. With regular parking outside our house often close to our driveway we have no sightline to ascertain vehicles turning out of Salisbury Avenue or moving traffic in the road. With our visibility considerably restricted we face a dangerous time reversing out of our driveway and have narrowly avoided collisions. It would seem that the road safety issue will still be with us but we wonder whether you have any suggestions to ease our concerns possibly with having a white line painted to cover the driveway with extensions both sides to provide some margin when we are reversing out. I would appreciate your comments on this matter. Finally we consider that the proposed extension of the yellow no parking lines on the northbound lane towards Sandpit Lane is insufficient taking into account the larger volume of northbound traffic which includes PPH coaches who use Beaumont Avenue as a rat run to avoid the Beechwood traffic lights. For safety it should match the planned yellow line on the southbound lane	Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. Further restrictions can be considered. However, a review of the area once any current proposals are implemented would be recommended. Residents can apply for a white access marking (H Bar) to help with driveway access. Unfortunately there is a charge of £120 to the resident. Please email us at parking.development@stalbans.gov.uk for more information or an application.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
2	Beaumont Avenue	I am writing to object to the proposals for yellow lines on Beaumont Avenue. The yellow lines at the entrance to St John's Court are unnecessary as no one parks at that point and there is no evidence of accidents in my experience. The yellow lines at the entrance to Salisbury Avenue are unnecessary as no one parks at that point and there is no evidence of accidents in my experience. The yellow lines adjacent to Sandpit Lane will take up valuable parking spaces for residents and visitors including parents of cubs and scouts who use this parking whilst going to the local Scout hut. The lack of parked vehicles will increase traffic speed. The officer time, painting of lines and notices will cost money that would be better spent on other council services.	Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
3	Beaumont Avenue	With reference to the proposals for yellow lines near the junction of Beaumont Avenue and Sandpit Lane. We live near the end of Beaumont Avenue near the junction with Sandpit Lane. We strongly agree with yellow lines near the junction and yellow lines on one side of Beaumont up to and past 106. Please include the space between the driveways of 104 and 106 as this space is too small to accommodate any car and causes issues today when someone parks there. The congestion and parking along this stretch has increased considerably since the parking restrictions in the ladder roads were introduced. We have also had difficulties getting in and out of our drive on a number of occasions and feel the current situation is unsafe on Beaumont and Sandpit Lane. We are also aware of contact between cars in this stretch of Beaumont due to the parking and congestion. Our only further suggestion would be to increase the yellow lines on one side further down Beaumont Avenue. While the proposals will improve the situation at the junction I fear they will move the parking problem further down the road with cars parking on both sides outside 104, 102, 100 and further down. We hope that these proposals go ahead and are not further reduced.	Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
4	Beaumont Avenue	I have just seen the revised plans and am disappointed at the removal of the double yellow lines outside my house. I live at #96. If there are cars parked either side of my driveway it makes driving off my driveway extremely dangerous as my view of the traffic is obscured. As the road is used as a cut through and cars do speed on the road I am always terrified that I will get hit by a speeding car. As cars are usually parked across my house as well (due in part to residents from St John's Court using our road to park their cars) it means that I have to reverse with extreme care. I appreciate that I could reverse into my driveway but because of cars being parked opposite my driveway it is impossible. Due to the lack of parking restrictions on our road and due to the implementation of them in other roads we have seen an increase in commercial vans being parked in our road. It makes the top end of Beaumont Avenue extremely dangerous due to the number of parked cars and the speed of cars being driven up our road.	Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
5	Beaumont Avenue	We refer to the amended proposal for parking in Beaumont Avenue. We are both firmly of the opinion the changes to the current arrangements are neither necessary nor desirable. Our house, no 100, is about halfway between Sandpit Lane and St Johns Court so we are fully aware of the traffic flows. There is really very little conflict of traffic, and even at peak times, delays can usually be measured in seconds. In nearly 40 years here, we have never been aware of any collision or danger resulting from the traffic. Why change what works perfectly well? Extending yellow lines southwards will simply mean car parking further down Beaumont Avenue to the annoyance and inconvenience of more households. Cars wanting to park will not suddenly go away. Parking changes usually produce unintended consequences. The ladder road scheme and restrictions in Hatfield Road have simply pushed parking further north away from the vehicle owner's home or work address to avoid Parking Permits. The previous plan, now thankfully abandoned, would have caused greater speeds and much greater inconvenience for houses at the top of Beaumont Avenue.	Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments

6	Beaumont Avenue	<p>The proposed parking regulations which aim to improve traffic flow inevitably will attract an increasing amount of traffic emanating from the roundabout which includes Hatfield Road/Ashley Road/Beechwood Avenue and making use of Beaumont Avenue as a 'rat run' to link to Sandpit Lane (thus avoiding the Ring Road junction of Beechwood Avenue with Sandpit Lane and this governed by Traffic Lights).</p> <p>Naturally enough the very existence of a 'rat run' along Beaumont Avenue is an existing hazard for children crossing the road to and from school etc as well as for residents easing their cars from their drives and the proposal is liable to increase the pace as well as the numbers involved with using this 'rat run'. There aren't any existing pedestrian crossing areas nor traffic speed modifying features and I therefore strongly urge you to introduce a speed limit of 20 mph, as a fair and reasonable balance for the safety of the residents and their families, preferably with a camera fitted midway. In my mind the safety balance suggested should precede the implementation of the parking proposal. Rat run minutes saved should not be at the expense of safety of residents.</p>	Unfortunately the districts remit does not extend to changing moving traffic such as speed limits or Highway design. Any such issues are the responsibility of the Police and / or The Highways Authority (Hertfordshire County Council) speed concerns can be raised with your elected County Councillor who would be better placed to raise matters with them. In terms of parking proposals, some changes to the proposals have been agreed. Please see previous comments.	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
7	Beaumont Avenue	<p>I'm writing to express our concerns over your recent letter proposing new parking restrictions on Beaumont Avenue. We own and live at 110 Beaumont Avenue, which is one of the few properties in Beaumont Avenue not to have off street parking (it was also one of the original cottage properties in the road) close to the junction with Sandpit Lane and would be directly affected by your proposals as they would have a double yellow line in front. We are, therefore, strongly opposed to such proposal.</p> <p>To give you some context – we are a family with 2 young children who we have to drive to school and back each day, having been allocated out third choice school which is 1.5 miles away. Under your current proposals we would have to park over 100 metres away from our home which would mean having to walk children a considerable distance – and that's if we're lucky enough to find a space. Whilst you are asking for feedback from more people on the street, it feels unfair to be basing a decision on individual preferences (and convenience). As a small minority of only 2-3 houses on the street without a drive, we feel both marginalised and discriminated against in these proposals, a feeling shared by others in a similar position. Whilst most house owners on the street are in the privileged position of having their own drive and don't require street parking, you are proposing putting double yellow lines in front of the houses which rely on this – therefore having a disproportionate impact on our households. The letter received claims these measures will improve the junction with Sandpit Lane. However, by adding double yellow lines at the entrance to the road to clear parking, I would imagine you will attract more through traffic into Beaumont Avenue as a convenient way to avoid the traffic lights at the junction of Sandpit Lane and Beechwood Avenue – and is likely to increase volume and speed of traffic passing through. This is particularly concerning as under your proposals we would have to cross the road each morning with our children to get to our car. Have your officers provided you with any assessment of the impact of these proposals on road safety up and down Beaumont Avenue as a result of introducing more and faster traffic up and down the Avenue? Furthermore, if you do need to reduce parking then I don't understand why you would not implement residents parking restrictions like you have done on other roads in St Albans. As mentioned, there are only very few residents who don't have a drive so this would significantly reduce any build-up of cars on the road, which is usually people parking for other reasons. I am keen to make sure that the voices of the few most impacted by these proposals are heard and given full consideration.</p>	<p>Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.</p>	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
8	Beaumont Avenue	<p>This email is related to the plan to add yellow lines at the north end of Beaumont Avenue (ref. Yel1-11/2022)</p> <p>We are opposed to the proposal. It will have a negative impact on parking outside our home, to safely leave our drive in our cars and the speed of traffic passing through.</p> <p>The restrictions at St John's Court entrance and the vicinity will force people to park outside the properties opposite the turning. Vehicles that once parked on the west side of Beaumont Avenue are likely to park outside our house and our neighbours. When we leave our drives, we will have a significantly restricted view both up and down our street</p> <p>Reducing the possibility of people parking on the street is likely to increase the average speed of traffic using Beaumont Avenue. commuters using the road as a cut-through will have a better line of sight, so they are less likely to slow down.</p>			
9	Beaumont Avenue	<p>Further to your letter of the 2nd February, I would like to object to the no waiting restrictions proposed for the top of Beaumont Avenue. I live at 112 and would lose my ability to park outside my house, as would my neighbours at 110.</p> <p>Please could you let me know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Why parking permits have not been offered to residents instead? 2.Why only one side could not be a restricted ? 3.Where I can find the evidence for justifying these plans eg how it will improve the amenity of the road, details of the number of incidences of inappropriate parking, information about the flow of traffic and how this will improve visibility. 4.Where you expect everyone who uses Beaumont Avenue to now park? e.g. nursery staff, scout staff and families, users of the Wick, church goers, motorcyclist trainees and of course, residents of Beaumont Ave and their families. 5.Why the majority of residents have opposed the scheme, yet it is still planned to go ahead? This does not make sense for our community. 	<p>Parking permits in this road have not been considered as there have been no suggestions that residents cannot park due to any parking generator. These proposals look to resolve sight line and obstruction issues which are present mainly at the junction with Sandpit Lane. Some changes have been agreed, please see previous comments for these.</p>	Unresolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
10	Beaumont Avenue	<p>Various comments made on the PDF map. Resident does not agree that the proposals will improve safety and will increase the risks and removes residents options for parking. They also suggest the bigger issue is vehicle speeds and that these proposals will increase that.</p>	<p>Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.</p>	Partially resolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments

11	Beaumont Avenue	<p>I wish to object to the parking proposal YE11-11/2022 on Beaumont Avenue.</p> <p>Any yellow lines will merely push the congestion further down the road. The main causes of the congested parking are only apparent during the working week, and the employees of the nursery school and others will just move down and block the road in other places. The road is narrow and bendy until it reaches Salisbury Ave North, and as such any disruption to parking will simply move the problem, not solve it. Part of this problem has been caused by the badly planned parking issues in other parts of the district, and we should not suffer from the impact with this proposed solution. My house is on one such bend and it is very dangerous to get out of the drive if cars are parked nearby, and impossible if they are on both sides of the road. We have suffered serious problems with this issue when there has been any slight disruption to the parking at the top of the road. This plan would impact us completely.</p> <p>There are numerous residents all along the road who require on-street parking and they should have access to parking near their homes. The lines will mean that they won't be able to park easily and will have to compete with the non-residents for fewer spaces, and all residents will be inconvenienced not just during working day but evenings and weekends as well, when there are no congestion problems. I notice that one of the goals of your plan is to reduce inconsiderate parking and improve visibility. But the for the residents on the bend at Beaumont Avenue you will definitely increase both. This is a badly devised attempt at a solution on the cheap, not taking into account the needs of residents. The only solution is a residents' permit parking from Sandpit Lane to Salisbury avenue to ensure there is space for residents to park, to relieve congestion, and allow ease of access to drives.</p> <p>For residents of any area there is a balance between being near the centre of town and amenities and parking. I traded location for parking ease and I seriously object to this being impacted for a parking plan on the cheap.</p>	<p>Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.</p>	Partially resolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments
12	Beaumont Avenue.	<p>We object to the proposed Order on a number of grounds that can be summarised as follows:-</p> <p>1.Neither we nor our neighbours are aware of concerns regarding parking in the area affecting our house. Some minor congestion does occur intermittently near the north end of Beaumont Avenue at busy times but this slows traffic which is a benefit as it serves to discourage through traffic using it as a cut-through to avoid Beechwood Avenue. 2.We have been consulted by Local Councillors representing us with regard to the alleged problem with traffic flows and we understand that in the road there is a clear majority against the proposals. 3.This is a residential area and as far as we are aware, inappropriate or inconsiderate parking is a non-existent or very rare problem. 4.The introduction of the restrictions at the junctions with St Johns Court and Salisbury Avenue is entirely un-necessary. In the 30+ years we have lived here we have never observed vehicles parking at or close to these junctions. Restrictions may well encourage more motorists to park elsewhere and could cause knock-on problems at the entrance to Garden Close and the adjacent bend in Salisbury Avenue. 5.Congestion is not a problem in our area neither are journey times or flows. Indeed, improved journey times imply greater traffic speeds and the speed of traffic using our road is a constant worry to many residents. This is a major concern for residents and was raised with our previous MP Mrs Anne Main by our neighbours. 6.This is a relatively quiet area. Traffic is virtually non-existent for the majority of the day. These are not busy intersections but junctions between residential roads that are relatively lightly trafficked. Waiting restrictions do not appear to be either necessary or appropriate in these locations. In addition we would like to make some further observations regarding the proposed waiting restrictions.</p> <p>Enforcement of the proposed restrictions will be difficult and only add to the pressure on personnel who are already unable to enforce traffic orders or restrictions at a number of more safety critical locations. The prohibited right turn from Camp Road into Stanhope Road and the no stopping on the zig-zags at the pedestrian crossing in Woodstock Road South at the junction with Hatfield Road are two examples where I observe regulations often being ignored. Finally, it seems to us that the proposed waiting restrictions are an un-necessary use of our scarce Council Tax funds. The exact purpose of the proposals is not clear and could well increase vehicle speeds which would compromise the safety of residents. For all the reasons set out above we object to the proposed waiting restrictions and trust the Council will reconsider this whole matter so that resources can be diverted to more pressing issues.</p>	<p>Following a review of the proposals and comments received, it has been agreed to remove the proposed no waiting at any time from 10 metres of its junction with Sandpit Lane up to outside number 104 on the eastern side of Beaumont Avenue. All other restrictions proposed will proceed as advertised. To clarify, the restrictions on the east side will remain unchanged from the current restrictions in place. This will include the section on Sandpit Lane leading up to the junction. No further changes can be proposed under this consultation.</p>	Partially resolved	Make order with the changes detailed in Council Comments

Col No	Road Ref.	Bowmans Green School Comments	Council Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Bowmans Green School	<p>I wanted to comment on the proposal Yel1-2022. I live on Telford Road in London Colney and will be affected by Schedule 3 Yel1-06/2022, number 11.</p> <p>I thoroughly approve of the proposal for the double yellow lines being placed where they are on the drawings. I regularly have to drive during school drop-off and pick-up times. I have a driveway and, on many occasions in both the morning and afternoon, I have struggled to drive in and out of my driveway. Cars park on both sides of the road and on either side of my driveway and there have even been instances of cars partially blocking the drive. I have spoken to other residents and they have encountered the same problems as myself.</p> <p>I have a child that attends the local school and have spoken to some of the parents who drive so I can understand their concerns about the proposal but, in a few years' time, they will be driving their children to another school and the parking issues will be a distant memory. However, I will still be living next to the school and encountering the same problems with a different set of parents. The parking restrictions will ensure that myself and my fellow residents will be able to freely access our homes during school drop-off and pick-up times and, more specifically, the double yellow lines will ensure that I can safely access my drive at all times.</p>	No Objections raised	Resolved	Make Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
2	Bowmans Green School	<p>I am writing to you regarding the above reference and proposed restrictions on Manor Road and Telford Road. I notice that Shenley Lane is not mentioned in your documents, however the map clearly shows that No Waiting is to be enforced on Shenley Lane at all times. I fail to see how yellow lines is going to solve the problem, when all it will do is push the traffic and parking further down Shenley Lane. At present, people park for a few minutes at drop off and pick up time, and this can remain without any issues.</p> <p>Drop off and pick up only takes approximately 15 minutes each time, but these proposed restrictions will affect the residents of Shenley Lane 365 days a year. It won't reduce the number of cars, just move them further round, essentially meaning more danger to children as they are having to walk further. It will also affect house prices which is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider your proposal to just include Telford Road and Manor Road, and leave Shenley Lane as it is.</p>	There is no evidence to suggest that parking restrictions which improve the amenity of an area or where they provide support of Highway Code Rules and Guidance, affects house prices. However, after careful consideration it is agreed to remove the majority of the proposed yellow lines in Shenley Lane. The proposals will still look to improve safety around the main junctions but with less impact on the road space available. The Council will monitor any impact from the scheme once installed.	Resolved	Make Order as advertised with the change suggested and agreed and any other recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
3	Bowmans Green School	<p>I write in support of the proposed parking changes around Bowmansgreen School, London Colney. The current situation is untenable with drivers ignoring traffic regulations and parking dangerously in the area. I also support the proposal to prevent parking on one side of Telford Road during school drop off and pick up times. The reduced width of the road due to parking causes congestion around the school, inappropriate u-turns and reversing, and a backlog to traffic on Shenley Lane making it difficult for pedestrians to safely cross the road.</p> <p>I would also support a restriction of heavy goods vehicles during these times as these often add to the difficulties during drop off and pick up times. Please could you also confirm that the zig-zags outside the redundant gate will be removed? I have been a parent at the school for 15 years and that gate has not been used during all this time.</p>	Unfortunately the Council is unable to promote any restrictions on moving traffic through this process but we will feedback the comments to the Highway Authority. The old school keep clear at the old gate will be removed.	Resolved	Make Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
4	Bowmans Green School	<p>I am writing to you regarding the above reference and proposed restrictions on Manor Road and Telford Road. I notice that Shenley Lane is not mentioned in your documents, however the map clearly shows that No Waiting is to be enforced on Shenley Lane at all times. Please reconsider adding double yellow lines as this is punishing the majority of considerate parents when it is the minority that need to be punished. At present, people park for a few minutes at drop off and pick up time, and this can remain without any issues.</p> <p>Drop off and pick up only takes approximately 15 minutes each time, but these proposed restrictions will affect the residents of Shenley Lane 365 days a year. It won't reduce the number of cars, just move them further round, essentially meaning more danger to children as they are having to walk further. There are parents who have children with disabilities also who have no choice but to use a car as it is too far for them to walk home. I urge you to reconsider your proposal as this will affect parents and elderly grandparents who have to collect children/grandchildren in all weathers and have to collect siblings in St Albans from secondary schools within a 20 minute time limit and have no choice but to use a car.</p>	After careful consideration it is agreed to remove the majority of the proposed yellow lines in Shenley Lane. The proposals will still look to improve safety around the main junctions but with less impact on the road space available. The Council will monitor any impact from the scheme once installed.	Resolved	Make Order as advertised with the change suggested and agreed and any other recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
5	Bowmans Green School	<p>I would like to object the proposed yellow lines around Bowmansgreen School. Parents will still need to park near the school entrance. Has any consideration been taken into account for them? Can't you enforce the yellow lines and zig zag lines that are there already?</p>	The current restrictions do not provide the required safety around the school. Currently parking by parents is causing significant danger to other road users and would impact access to the emergency services for residents in the area and the school. Alternative parking for parents is available within walking distance to the school. A survey of the surrounding roads would indicate that sufficient parking is available and in a safer and more manageable way. Caledon Road itself is under utilised and provides a safer alternative. There are also car parks available including the Caledon Community Centre and at the Coop on Haseldine Road. The school does accommodate the need for parents or children with more specific needs where a vehicle would be required closer to the school.	Unresolved	Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report

6	Bowmans Green School	<p>The governing body met this evening and discussed the proposed changes to the parking on Telford and Manor road in reference Yel1-2022.</p> <p>We think this would make significant improvements to the safety of children and parents at school drop off and to road users trying to drive near school at these busy times.</p> <p>We would be delighted if they are able to be implemented in full.</p>	No Objections raised	Resolved	Make Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
7	Bowmans Green School	<p>I completely understand why these restrictions have been proposed as the congestion and irresponsible parking does seem to have escalated over the past few months. I also agree the safety of children is paramount and therefore the parking cannot continue as it is. However, as a working parent I cannot see how I will be able to drop off my child and get to work on time with these new restrictions imposed. I currently only have 15 minutes to get from school drop off to work as it is and I think this will be made so much harder with these restrictions as the same issue will be encountered by all drivers, but in a different area of the road. I'm sure there are so many other parents that also face the same difficulties or similar. I believe there will still be gridlocked roads, disgruntled residents, cars parked on grass verges and potential danger to pedestrian traffic, perhaps even more so with the limited choice of places to park once these parking restrictions are in place. I understand this should rightly encourage more pupils and parents to walk to school and I would take this option if I could however I do not have time and no longer live in the village like a lot of other families of Bowmansgreen students. When the Covid 19 restrictions were still in place, the school implemented a staggered start time which I found to have a very positive impact on the traffic levels on the roads outside the school and I feel this could be a proposed option before completely restricting any parking at all during peak school times. The school has been in the same place for 70 years and I cannot understand how nothing has been implemented previously to keep pupils safe and minimise traffic and now the extremity of no parking is being proposed with no other (known/publicised) exploration of other options to tackle this issue. I would like to know if there is any way we can object to this proposal and explore other possibilities to tackle the issue at hand, the staggered start time for students being a strong suggestion and a start to these conversations.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the safety of children and local residents must be our priority. Parents must remain responsible for how they manage their school journeys but this cannot impact the safety of road users or residents. The Council is not in a position to ensure schools change their times to accommodate. The school themselves may wish to respond to a staggered start and / or finish time. That said, it is likely that such approach would not benefit the school or many parents both financially or personally. Having surveyed the area over many weeks, the Council suggests that alternative parking is available. However, it is the responsibility of the driver of a vehicle to make a judgement as to if they are making best use of alternative parking or parking for convenience. In many cases it is convenient parking which is put above available parking which is the main cause of some of the various issues around school pick up and drop off times.</p>	Unresolved	Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report
8	Bowmans Green School	<p>I wish to object to the proposed Order, Yel1-06/2022 in respect of Telford and Manor Roads, London Colney. I am happy to support: - the proposal for a no-stopping zone on the school markings; and - the proposals for no waiting at any time zones on the various corners These should both have been in place long ago. I wish to object to the proposed 'no waiting 08.00-09.00 and 14.30-15.30' zones between 4-14 Telford Road, 18-20 Telford Road and 4-12 Manor Road. In relation to your five claimed reasons for the proposal, I do not believe that this proposal will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Improve road safety At the moment, cars travel slowly along these stretches of road because there is car parking on each side of the road. Under your proposal, the "free road space" will be twice as wide, enabling cars and other vehicles to travel faster and thus place children attending the school and their families in greater danger. I hope you are aware that the 20mph limit is not enforced, so cars will likely travel at 30mph-plus under your proposals. 2, Assist the movement of traffic and/or pedestrians I accept that your proposal will assist the movement of through-traffic. But, as above, it will make the road more dangerous for pedestrians due to vehicles traveling faster 3, Improve the amenity of the road and its surroundings I do not know who you believe that the amenity will be improved for? Certainly, it will reduce amenity for residents of the roads in question. There are currently barely sufficient parking spaces for local residents. If you halve the number of parking spaces, then residents' cars will simply be pushed further down the road into parts of the road that are equally hard-pressed for space. I have counted the numbers of cars parked in locations that would be displaced under your overall proposal. On Friday 21 January at 09.00, you would have displaced 15 vehicles On Thursday 3 February at 09.00, you would have displaced 16 vehicles On Monday 7 February at 14.55, you would have displaced 17 vehicles 4, Reduce instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking; This seems most unlikely. If, as you intend, half the road is clear of parked cars, then that would provide an easy opportunity for cars delivering or picking up children from school to stop in that empty space. In my opinion, therefore, inappropriate parking would be increased by your proposals 5, Improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances; As above, I support the restrictions at road junctions and corners. But I would challenge whether you have any evidence that there are current problems with regard to parking near property entrances. What your proposal will do is add further incentive to residents to build cross-overs, thus increasing the potential risk around property entrances, with more vehicles crossing over the pedestrian area. But not everyone can afford this. At the moment, three of the houses immediately affected do not have a cross-over - will you share the cost of them doing so? Overall, your proposal does not contribute to road safety, while providing inconvenience to local residents. It is, furthermore, a penalty on those households who cannot afford a driveway. I would make one additional point. Given the scale above of vehicles that you would be displacing, they will almost certainly move to unforeseen locations further along the road, including to further households without cross-overs. Your consultation is targeted at the small area that is most immediately affected rather than residents who are equally affected by the knock-on effect. This is a poor consultation and should be repeated, including giving full information to residents further afield. 	<p>Thank you. As with some previous comments we must focus on the reality of the safety concerns raised and what vehicle owners can do to assist with the issues. This will include what residents can do. In general parking is and will remain to be a continent option. The issue with this is that many drivers will park for convenience and may not consider the impact. In this case alternative parking is available. A survey of the surrounding roads shows that alternative parking can be accommodated, this was seen in areas like Caledon Road, other parts of Manor road and Telford Road. In addition, car park space was also found to be available at the Co-op and Caledon Club. These alternatives provide parking for both residents and school parents. Whilst removing the current parking issues will, for some drivers, allow increased speed. The majority will remain law abiding and overall safety will be improved. The current situation means that visibility for young children is impossible, vehicles are mounting pavements and verges whilst pedestrians are on them and vehicle speeds are even more dangerous given that visibility is so reduced. Emergency access is severely impacted and measured road widths mean that a fire engine would be impacted if called to an emergency. The proposed restrictions will provide improved safety, all round. However, it must be clear. There is no complete fix, we are suggesting improved safety not that all safety concerns will be removed. In many cases this is very unlikely and we can only look for improvements.</p>	Unresolved	Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report

9	Bowmans Green School	<p>I am a resident of Shenley Lane, London Colney AL2 . I have become aware, that without any apparent consultation with residents at our end of Shenley Lane, there is a proposal to make the end of the service road, at the junction of Shenley Lane and Telford Road, a no stopping double yellow at all times. I understand this is due to unsafe practices and violations of the highway code when dropping off at Bowmansgreen School. I fail to see how a proposal of this kind will make the drop off at the school any safer for the children or the road users. It is likely to lead to greater violations - the degree to which the restrictions are ignored around the Co-op at Haseldine Road is evidence of this and the impossibility of enforcement by police or other authorities makes it highly unlikely that anyone violating will be caught. But more importantly, this will not change the number of vehicles on the road being used to drop off children. It will simply move them to other points around the local area. Our service road is sandwiched between two primary schools who have high traffic volume at the start and end of the day. Your proposals will simply push more vehicles up the service road and there is nowhere safe to drop off for St Bernadettes School on Walsingham Way other than stopping on Shenley Lane. Pushing more vehicles up the road will lead to greater congestion on Shenley Lane itself which is already used by cars speeding too fast to cut through to the M25 and the A1M. The result of which will be backed up traffic, blocked driveways and my children will not be able to safely leave their home without fear of cars behaving erratically. It will also have a detrimental impact on the house prices. Moreover, the solution is clearly not to make the enforcement on Shenley Lane/Telford Road a 24 hour restriction - which seems to be a proposal that is based on no sensible planning. There is nowhere else for visitors to residents on Shenley Lane to stop - the service road provides safe and appropriate parking for visitors. The issue, as I understand it, is to ensure the children can get to Bowmansgreen School safely and the Highway code violations become less frequent. The solution is evidently not to punish residents on Shenley Lane. Rather, education of families in Bowmansgreen School (increasing walking/cycling to school, road safety awareness and regular enforcement of existing violations), requiring the school to provide stewards to ensure safe parking and drop-off/pick up, creating more access points to the school to relieve the congestion at the main gate and identifying other parking locations where families can stop safely (such as the library). The planning proposal seems to be ill thought through and based on insufficient evidence that the proposed solution will have the desired effect. Visitors to Shenley Lane/Telford Road will be unable to stop and visit residents outside of the time of school drop off and pick up thus affecting our house further up the service road. As I understand Shenley Lane is not sufficiently analysed in your documentation.</p>	<p>After careful consideration it is agreed to remove the majority of the proposed yellow lines in Shenley Lane. The proposals will still look to improve safety around the main junctions but with less impact on the road space available. The Council will monitor any impact from the scheme once installed. To be clear, these proposals are intended to improve road safety, they are not intended to improve parking at school pick up and drop off as indicated. The current situation means that road safety affects residents, children and other pedestrians of the school and pedestrians in general. In addition emergency access is severely impeded and a Fire Engine would not be able to gain access to a resident or the school in sufficient time. I would agree that enforcement is difficult and cannot be provided 24/7 but overall, restrictions mean noticeable improvements and vastly improved safety.</p>	unresolved	<p>Make Order as advertised with the change suggested and agreed and any other recommended changes detailed in the scheme report</p>
10	Bowmans Green School	<p>Regarding the proposed parking restrictions for Manor Road London Colney We live on Manor Road which is up from Bowmans Green School. I have lived in this house since I was born 70 years, and have always parked my car on the road outside now to be legal we will have to move our vehicles twice a day and try to find a parking spot a lot further away .(if we can find one) . Unfortunately we do not have a drive way like the vast majority of our neighbours. The plans proposed shows that there is parking available on the opposite side of the road to our house however there is often vehicles parked there . We understand that the safety of the children is paramount but for residents like ourselves this will cause us a lot of stress and anxiety . Maybe parking bays on the opposite side of the road for residents who are disrupted would help to alleviate this</p>	<p>Thank you, Unfortunately parking bays at this time are not an option. Whilst these proposals may cause some inconvenience, they are needed and provide important road safety. Parking on the highway is available throughout Manor Road, Telford Road and Caledon Road among many others and unfortunately with many restrictions, it does mean some residents will benefit and some will be more impacted. We must always put road safety above any parking allowances.</p>	Unresolved	<p>Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes</p>
11	Bowmans Green School	<p>Further to receiving notification of the above and in particular in relation to the plan YEL1-06/2022, we live at 61 Shenley Lane which is the end house on the corner of Shenley Lane and Telford Road. Whilst we understand that it gets busy twice a day for the school pick-up/drop off, this is something we have accepted living close to the school. Yes there have been some incidents but not to the extent where local residents need to be penalised for this. I would kindly recommend that you speak with the school and ask them to stagger their drop off and pick up times (this happens at my children's school), this will ease the pressure on the local roads and would therefore elevate the need for such a drastic introduction of yellow lines, which would not only affect the houses that will have these outside of, but also the surrounding roads because the problem will be pushed out there and visitors to us will have to find somewhere else to park, again penalising the residents! Please therefore consider how the introduction of this will impact us the local residents and our visitors and of course the values of our properties should enforcement be introduced. I therefore firmly object to your proposal and would urge you to work with the schools to stagger drop off / pick up times.</p>	<p>After careful consideration it is agreed to remove the majority of the proposed yellow lines in Shenley Lane. The proposals will still look to improve safety around the main junctions but with less impact on the road space available. The Council will monitor any impact from the scheme once installed.</p>	Unresolved	<p>Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report</p>

12	Bowmans Green School	<p>I must be clear that I am in support of the proposals for Manor Road and Telford Road, due to all the reasons you have listed. What we are against is any restrictions on Shenley Lane, and specifically outside of our house. Why do you feel the need to have no waiting At Any Time on Shenley Lane? Why is it not restricted hours, as per the proposal for Manor Road and Telford Road? Why is it affecting Shenley Lane in such a serious way, when Shenley Lane isn't even mentioned on your documents? Where are any of my visitors or my neighbours visitors meant to park if you enforce this? Have you looked at alternative solutions, for example, make Manor Road a one way system? Or have parents helping out to get children out the cars when arriving at school? The school my children go to have a drive through drop off system, which I appreciate isn't necessarily possible with Bowmansgreen, but having 5/6 parents helping out each day to get children out the car safely, would eliminate parents having to park and get out the car and move the traffic away quicker. I understand that currently independent walkers use the back gate, and everyone else uses the front. Bearing in mind the large car park next to the school and behind Co-Op, could you switch around which entrance the children are using? I strongly feel that this needs to be reconsidered, on Shenley Lane only. We have no issues and have never complained about the school traffic, and whilst safety of the children is absolutely a priority, putting yellow lines on Shenley Lane is not going to help the situation.</p> <p>I am writing to you regarding the above reference and proposed restrictions on Manor Road and Telford Road. I notice that Shenley Lane is not mentioned in your documents, however the map clearly shows that No Waiting is to be enforced on Shenley Lane at all times. I am a resident of 61 Shenley Lane, and I do not support this proposal. I fail to see how yellow lines is going to solve the problem, when all it will do is push the traffic and parking further down Shenley Lane. At present, we have people parking outside our house for a few minutes at drop off and pick up time, and I am quite happy for this to remain. I would much rather have that, than when I have visitors over, they are then unable to park outside my house at all. In my opinion, drop off and pick up only takes approximately 15 minutes each time, but these proposed restrictions will affect us residents 365 days a year. It won't reduce the number of cars, just move them further round, essentially meaning more danger to children as they are having to walk further. It will also affect house prices which is totally unnecessary. I urge you to take my comments on board, amongst others who no doubt agree. I attach a link to the petition I created, which so far 43 people have signed. Now I know this by no means shows large numbers, however for a local issue in a very small area, I believe this shows a good amount of people that do not agree with your proposal.</p>	<p>After careful consideration it is agreed to remove the majority of the proposed yellow lines in Shenley Lane. The proposals will still look to improve safety around the main junctions but with less impact on the road space available. The Council will monitor any impact from the scheme once installed.</p>	Unresolved	<p>Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report</p>
13	Bowmans Green School	<p>I am writing to you regarding the above reference and proposed restrictions on Manor Road and Telford Road. I fail to see how yellow lines is going to solve the problem, when all it will do is push the traffic and parking further down Shenley Lane, which will also affect St Bernadette's school, which also has a parking/driving issue At present, people park for a few minutes at drop off and pick up time, and this can remain without any issues. Drop off and pick up only takes approximately 15 minutes each time, but these proposed restrictions will affect the residents who live in the houses close to the school 365 days a year. It won't reduce the number of cars, just move them further round, essentially meaning more danger to children as they are having to walk further.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider your proposal ,have you considered a lay-by to the left and right hand sides of the short bit of telford rd ,this would help to ease congestion at peak times ,this could be a drop off point. It is unfair to expect property owners to not be able to park outside their homes 365 days of the year, some of the affected houses do not have driveways ,because of a small group of inconsiderate drivers .Also would a crossing be an idea ,because with the lack of enforcement things will not change .</p> <p>One last point this has got worse since the school initiated a one way system(covid led) regarding infants and juniors ,so parents with multiple children cannot walk through school grounds to each playground ,there is ample room to make a circular one way route around the school using the back way ,meaning parents who drive can park in the co op carpark in hazeldine rd ,or the library I repeat the residents are obviously concerned for the safety of the children, these measures will not help .</p>	<p>These proposals are intended to improve road safety and access, not only for the school but surrounding residents. Overall driving and parking remains the responsibility of the parents and residents in the area. There are sufficient alternatives which all drivers should take in to consideration and take responsibility for. Road safety measures are put in place to encourage better driving and parking but more importantly to ensure the safety of all road users including pedestrians is the priority. We understand that such measures will not be welcomed by all, but we must prioritise in favour of road safety.</p>	Unresolved	<p>Whilst unresolved the priority remains road safety, emergency access and safety around the school entrances. We must therefore recommend to Make the Order as advertised with any recommended changes detailed in the scheme report</p>

Col No	Road Ref.	Burydell Lane Comments	Council Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Burydell lane	I fully support the proposals which I think are necessary to ensure the ability of motor traffic to freely pass up and down the road and in particular larger vehicles engaged in refuse collection or emergency services	No Objection Raised	N/A	Make Order as advertised
2	Burydell lane	I would like to thank you for the correspondence regarding Burydell lane. Having the yellow lines will make it much easier getting in and out of Burydell lane, for us home owners but also the dustbin trucks and delivery.	No Objection Raised	N/A	Make Order as advertised
3	Burydell Lane	We are still experiencing parking problems for us residents of Burydell Lane due to the offices opposite now using the road as an overflow car park and more often than not the residents have to park away from their homes or up the end of Burydell Lane.	No Objection Raised	N/A	Make Order as advertised

Col No	Road Ref.	Chester Gibbons Green Comments	Council Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Chester Gibbons Green	I would like to give my comments on the proposed double yellow lines in the above areas in London Colney. I support the double yellow lines proposed for the High Street outside and opposite The White Horse pub as vehicles parked here make this section of the road hazardous due to restricted passing space for cars and visibility. In Chester Gibbons Green I support the double yellow lines on the side of the street next to the block of flats numbered 27 - 33 as the road is not wide enough to allow parking on both sides. When this happens it can be hard for residents to drive up the road and it would probably be impossible for an emergency vehicle such as a fire engine to get through. However, I do not think it is necessary to have double yellow lines on the side of the road against block 1-8 as residents use this for parking and it is perfectly safe for shoppers/pub and mosque visitors to park here too.	Following a review, it is agreed to amend the proposal by removing the double yellow line proposal on the southeast side	Resolved	Make Order as advertised

Col No	Road Ref.	Cravells Road Comments	Council Comments / Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Cravells Road	<p>On the 14/1/17 I wrote to your office with a similar objection and thankfully everything remained the same until your latest proposal. Your plan has double yellow lines proposed opposite the block of cottages. As stated in my letter of 14/1/17 the pavement does not continue further than the bridge making it extremely dangerous to cross the road to join the pavement opposite which runs to the top of Cravells Road.</p> <p>The area described is regularly used by locals to park, the vast majority of people respect this and park considerately. As stated in my previous letter (14/1/17) I lived on East Common the area referred has been used for parking for many years. I have lived at Cravells Road for seven years and to my knowledge have been no incidents. I am aware of the pavement law the government may impose in England imposing fines of £70.00</p> <p>In the interest of residents, visitors, delivery drivers, our window cleaner (Removed for GDPR) all of whom have to use their cars to travel to work. If the space was confiscated it would have significant implication on their lives not only to them but all of us.</p> <p>With regard to the double yellow lines proposed on the corner of Dickinsons Fields, this would remove a valuable space opposite the cottages.</p> <p>This plan has been orchestrated by a resident in Dickinsons Fields for a long time. The residents of Dickinsons Fields all have parking and some garages, there is no problem for them to turn right down Cravells Road especially now you have the 20mph parking enforced.</p> <p>With regard to houses with off road parking. If they agree to your proposals it would be questionable as when they have guests builders, they make full use of the parking available. Making your proposed changes would not improve road safety. They would not assist the movement of traffic and pedestrians. Imagine having to cart heavy shopping, driving round for ages looking for a space wasting fuel adding pollution and generally stressing out.</p> <p>I urge you not to make your proposed changes on the basis of our quality of living on this lovely road. Please acknowledge receipt of my objection.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the current parking in the area is causing sight line issues for residents existing Dickinsons Fields. This was evident on various site visits and also evident in the photos provided with your letter. In addition, the highway code specifies that vehicles should not park within 10 metres or opposite a junction. The proposals will reinforce the highway code and improve safety for all road users including, pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicles. I appreciate that there may be some impact on residents. However, the Council must prioritise road safety and traffic movements over parking provisions. The area leading up to the bridge is not a recognised parking area and is not sufficient to be occupied by vehicles and in some cases the vehicle will straddle in to the road obstructing moving traffic. The key principle for these proposals is to ensure that emergency vehicles can pass through, within this in mind I cannot approve the area for no restrictions and must recommend that the proposals are moved forward.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
2	Cravells Road	<p>I am writing to inform you that as a resident of Cravells Rd, I strongly object to your proposed restriction, reference Yel1-04/2022. I feel your proposed scheme does not meet any needs of the resident or the community, your proposed scheme would have a great impact on the community.</p> <p>As you are aware the parking for residents is already restricted / limited and your proposed scheme would just reduce the limited parking even further.</p> <p>Your public notice states, improve road safety, improve visibility at road junctions and property entrances; I am unclear how this was determined and the statistical information that was drawn upon to make the conclusion</p> <p>As a resident I am not aware of any of the above being raised by residents?; has there been a request for the members of the council to act, please note the council were elected by the community to serve in a public office for the benefit of the public; this does not seem to be the case, in fact the total opposite.</p> <p>I do not understand your rational of the proposed scheme; therefore I reiterate my strong objection to your proposed plan.</p> <p>I will be supporting all objections by other residents, and I will be a signatory of the residents letter.</p>	<p>The Council has an obligation to manage parking on the highway on behalf of the Highways Authority. The key principle to managing parking is road safety and traffic flow. This means that the key principle must be put before the needs of residents in terms of where residents can or should park. In this case local residents have highlighted an issue exiting Dickinsons Fields with near missis due to sight lines being obstructed by parked vehicles. On review by Council Officers, it was noted that vehicles were in contravention of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 and the Highway Code. The regulations state that a vehicle should not park within 10 metres of or opposite a junction. The purpose of this rule is to allow sufficient site lines and avoid any possible collisions, this includes being able to see smaller vehicles such as cyclists and motorcyclists. The proposed restrictions are considered sufficient to ensure the Council meets its obligation to promote road safety.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
3	Cravells Road	I hope you are well. I would like to object to the proposed changes on Cravells Road, reference Yel1-2022	No comments on the reasons for objections. Therefore there is nothing the Council is able to respond to.	N/A	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
4	Cravells Road	<p>Today I received a note from a neighbour saying the Council propose adding double yellow lines on Cravells Rd, where I live. If this is indeed proposed then I'd anticipate major objections from all residents. The letter is suggesting we all write to the council to oppose such measures.</p> <p>I'm sure there must be more information on this somewhere online; can you point me to the right source please.</p>	Information was available on our website and this was indicated on the public	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
5	Cravells Road	<p>I am very concerned with the proposed plans of Yel1 - 04/22 Cravells Road.</p> <p>I regularly visit with my disabled son. If the proposed plans were implemented it would make visiting virtually impossible. Whilst visiting I need regular access to my vehicle for equipment and supplies. If we could not park outside I would not be able to carry our essentials and walk/push with him safely from further a field. It would not be possible and dangerous. My mother is also ageing and lives alone. The thought of her not being able to park outside her house is a worry. The thought of her walking alone from her car to the house at night is unacceptable. She will also struggle with shopping. Therefore this plan will have a negative impact on her life and limit her independence. Whilst visiting in the past I have never had any trouble parking and even with a wheelchair felt that walking up or down Cravells road was dangerous.</p> <p>I therefore plead for you to reconsider the plan for yellow lines.</p>	<p>The proposals do not remove all parking from outside numbers 74 to 84, some parking will remain available with approximately only 1 vehicle length being restricted. In addition, disabled badge holders can park on double and single yellow lines with a disabled badge for up to 3 hours. However, please ensure that parking is not within 10 metres of or opposite a junction.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
6	Cravells Road	I hereby strongly object to the addition of yellow lines to prevent parking on Cravells Road as this will leave us unable to park our vehicles. Parking on Cravells Road is already a nightmare as there are very limited spaces. It will also place further pressures on the very limited spaces on Cravells Road.	<p>These proposals are likely to displace up to 3 vehicles, this would be considered limited in terms of displacement and considered appropriate when considering the principle of road safety measures as proposed. We recognise any removal of parking is inconvenient but we must prioritise road safety and traffic movements.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures

7	Cravells Road	<p>Thank you for your email. I have now concluded consultation with The Residents of Cravells Road and attach our objections to your proposals (Yel1-04/2022), signed by in excess of thirty residents.</p> <p>We have sent these these objections to you in writing both by post and to parking.development@stalbens.gov.uk. I have also forwarded our objections to Bim Afolami (MP for Hitchin and Harpenden) and Teresa Heritage (County Councillor for Harpenden South West).</p> <p>I am writing with regard to public notice Yel1-04/2022 about your intent to add "No Waiting at Any Time" restrictions to Cravells Road in Harpenden.</p> <p>As a road that primarily consists of terraced houses with no access to off-street parking, I am deeply concerned about the detrimental impact that your proposals will have to the residents and community should such measures go ahead. Furthermore, as the homeowner of , I am directly impacted by your proposals which are adjacent to my property. Please consider this email as notice of my intent to formally object to these proposals, which I will do with supporting evidence in due course. To facilitate my right to oppose these restrictions, please send me full details of the proposals, any justification that you may have for these and any associated documentation for me to examine. On receipt of these, I will formulate my objection within a timely manner.</p> <p>I am writing with regard to public notice Yel1-04/2022 about your intent to add "No Waiting at Any Time" restrictions to Cravells Road in Harpenden.</p> <p>As a road that primarily consists of terraced houses with no access to off-street parking, I am deeply concerned about the detrimental impact that your proposals will have to the residents and community should such measures go ahead. Furthermore, as the homeowner of (removed) Cravells Road, I am directly impacted by your proposals which are adjacent to my property. Please consider this email as notice of my intent to formally object to these proposals, which I will do with supporting evidence in due course.</p> <p>To facilitate my right to oppose these restrictions, please send me full details of the proposals, any justification that you may have for these and any associated documentation for me to examine. On receipt of these, I will formulate my objection within a timely manner. I request that you do not impose any restrictions until my objection has been taken in to account and look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the current parking in the area is causing sight line issues for residents existing Dickinsons Fields. This was evident on various site visits and also evident in the photos provided with your letter. In addition, the highway code specifies that vehicles should not park within 10 metres or opposite a junction. The proposals will reinforce the highway code and improve safety for all road users including, pedestrians, cyclists and other vehicles. I appreciate that there may be some impact on residents. However, the Council must prioritise road safety and traffic movements over parking provisions. The area leading up to the bridge is not a recognised parking area and is not sufficient to be occupied by vehicles and in some cases the vehicle will straddle in to the road obstructing moving traffic. The key principle for these proposals is to ensure that emergency vehicles can pass through, within this in mind I cannot approve the area for no restrictions and must recommend that the proposals are moved forward.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
8	Cravells Road	<p>Please find the letter noting our objections attached, signed by in excess of thirty residents of Cravells Road.</p> <p>We trust that you will act democratically and in the interests of the whole community and not just a chosen few and take these thirty plus objections in to account.</p> <p>Also copied (for visibility) are Bim Afolami (MP for Hitchin and Harpenden) and Teresa Heritage (County Councillor for Harpenden South West).</p>	<p>Please refer to all previous comments. Please note that the multi signed letter has been considered. And the responses provided within this summary table apply. A copy of this table and a response has been provided to Bim Afolami MP.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
9	Cravells Road	<p>I am writing to object to some of the proposals proposed in this scheme as I consider that not enough consideration has been given to the parking needs of the current residents at nos 74-84 Cravells Road. I would suggest that a conversation with residents is required before this scheme is progressed. For instance can better use be made of the pavement opposite these cottages? The pavement only leads to the bridge! This scheme will only displace residents' cars and potentially lead to more disruption and inconsiderate parking. I am very happy to be included in any conversations. I am copying in the local district councillors for their information.</p>	<p>Whilst we appreciate that residents may wish to make other recommendations for parking concessions, we have to look at the key principles of our obligation to manage the Highway in terms of road safety and traffic flow. This includes emergency access. Whilst we would be happy to discuss options with residents, those options are limited with lengthy time scales. Residents can contact us separately to discuss further options outside of this proposal. However, I must recommend that these proposals are of a more urgent nature. In terms of the pavement parking opposite the houses mentioned, I am afraid I am unable to endorse this and must insist that double yellow lines are also progressed to ensure safety and access is maintained. It is my assessment that parking at this location is obstructive and causes significant sight line issues for moving traffic.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures
10	Cravells Road	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Cravells Road, Harpenden.</p> <p>I have lived in Cravells Road for many years and the parking situation has deteriorated considerably over time with more and more cars chasing fewer spaces. The Council must be aware there are simply not enough parking spaces in Cravells Road and the surrounding areas to satisfy demand and rather than focusing on initiatives that reduce the overall parking spaces the council should, as a matter of urgency, be looking at ways to increase parking in Cravells Road and the Southdown area to help alleviate the current parking crisis.</p> <p>I work shifts and regularly get home after 20.00 and it is very rare for me to get parked outside my home and I often have to park either in the car park at the bottom of the road which is frequently full or along St Johns Road both a considerable distance from my home.</p> <p>If the council agrees to these restriction it will be failing the residents of Cravells Road and the Southdown area as they do nothing to address the current parking problems, they will reduce road safety, increase instances of inappropriate or inconsiderate parking as people struggle to find places to park and will only serve to further erode the quality of life for residents of Cravells Road and the Southdown area.</p>	<p>These proposals are likely to displace up to 3 vehicles, this would be considered limited in terms of displacement and considered appropriate when considering the principle of road safety measures as proposed. We recognise any removal of parking is inconvenient but we must prioritise road safety and traffic movements.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised to support road safety measures

Col No	Road Ref.	Roundwood Park Comments	Council Comments / Response	Resolved/ unresolved or removed	Recommendation
1	Roundwood Park	<p>Just to say that I also refer to the proposed zig-zag extension in front of No 11, which is also unnecessary.</p> <p>This Planning application has just been brought to my attention. I have lived in Roundwood Park for over 35 years. The last time proposals of this magnitude were planned we were written to individually, not just stuck on a lamp post hoping we would see it. So please accept this submission.</p> <p>When we first arrived in Roundwood Park, over 35 years ago, there was no yellow paint on the road, and only 2 coaches parked outside our house, and that was it.</p> <p>My objection is the extension of the zig-zags. Why?</p> <p>During the day, Roundwood Park is a very quiet road and we need to be able to use the parking facility as far as possible. For example, today and for the next 10 days, we have a contractor repainting our kitchen units and he is parking his van outside No6 where you want to extend the zig-zags. Dog walkers also park on this section to walk their dogs on the Nicky Line. There is no logical reason why this section of the road should change with respect to parking restrictions.</p> <p>I would also like parking restrictions that are due to school timings should say so and should say 'Term time only'. During the summer holidays, we have had numerous parking tickets over the years for parking outside our home, which were rescinded straight away, but we do not want the worry or the hassle.</p> <p>Please do not forget that this was originally a residential area and primarily it should remain so.</p>	<p>The School keep clear extension is proposed to improve safety around the school entrances and crossing points. The School keep clear restrictions will only be operational during school term times. This will also apply to the single yellow lines. However, any double yellow lines will remain enforceable.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised
2	Roundwood Park	<p>I have lived in Roundwood Park for over 35 years. The last time proposals of this magnitude were planned we were written to individually, not just stuck on a lamp post hoping we would see it. So please accept this submission. When we first arrived in Roundwood Park, over 35 years ago, there was no yellow paint on the road, and only 2 coaches parked outside our house, and that was it. My objection is the extension of the zig-zags. Why? During the day, Roundwood Park is a very quiet road and we need to be able to use the parking facility as far as possible. For example, today and for the next 10 days, we have a contractor repainting our kitchen units and he is parking his van outside No6 where you want to extend the zig-zags. Dog walkers also park on this section to walk their dogs on the Nicky Line. There is no logical reason why this section of the road should change with respect to parking restrictions. I would also like parking restrictions that are due to school timings should say so and should say 'Term time only'. During the summer holidays, we have had numerous parking tickets over the years for parking outside our home, No5, which were rescinded straight away, but we do not want the worry or the hassle. Please do not forget that this was originally a residential area and primarily it should remain so.</p>	<p>The School keep clear extension is proposed to improve safety around the school entrances and crossing points. The School keep clear restrictions will only be operational during school term times. This will also apply to the single yellow lines. However, any double yellow lines will remain enforceable.</p>	Unresolved	Make Order as advertised
3	Roundwood Park	<p>I am the homeowner at Roundwood Park Harpenden and am writing in response to the publication of plans for new parking restrictions on my road. My wife and I fully understand the rationale for wanting to bring in these restrictions, to better manage parking and stopping outside Roundwood Park School. We believe that an effect of the new restrictions will be to discourage cars that park for school business over a long period during the day from parking close to it. Instead, they will move to our end of Roundwood Park and we will see much more parking throughout the day outside our house and between our house and Roundwood Lane. When that happens at the moment, for example on parents' evenings or if there are lots of builder's vans around, we have great difficulty getting out of our drive safely. It becomes a blind exit and there is a risk of being hit by cars driving fast from either direction. With this likely effect in mind, we have two requests so that we can get in and out of our drive safely after the restrictions are in place: 1. We note from the maps that there is to be a double yellow line immediately outside our house, on our side of the road. Please ensure that, as is shown on your plan, the double yellow line comes all the way up to our drive so that nobody can park on our side of the road between our house and no 31. If that is not done and someone parks between our house and no 31, we will not safely be able to get in or out. This will be especially so if there are more cars parked immediately outside or opposite our house after the new restrictions come in. 2. Please consider extending the double yellow line that is planned for outside our house on the opposite side of the road, so that it extends further towards Roundwood Lane, at least as far as the planned double yellow line on our side of the road. On the attached photo, I have marked the ideal position so that we can easily exit our drive. This would stop all day parking on the other side of the road opposite our drive and again, would make it easier for us to get out of our drive safely when the new restrictions come in. I have attached a pdf photo with explanations so you can visualise the two requests I am making.</p>	<p>The extension proposed outside 31 and 31a is agreed following a review of the area and the request from the resident of the property concerned. However, under this proposal we cannot extend the yellow lines opposite as they have not been advertised and any extension would exceed any variant allowed. We can review this once the restrictions proposed are commissioned.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised with extension of double yellow lines outside 31 and 31a

4	Roundwood Park	<p>I've serious reservations about the changes to double yellow lines. We live at number 19a (marked on the map), at the moment there are no parking restrictions in front of our house but you're proposing double yellow lines be extended right across us. Like the rest of our section of the road we have a problem with school rush hour parking and access, but absolutely no problems outside of these times. I would like to understand why it's being proposed to stop all parking in front of us instead of just the single line provision? It would unnecessarily restrict parking for our visitors and other users such as the Royal Mail and does not seem necessary. There are double yellow lines already directly on the corner with Medlows which makes sense but extending this seems wrong. A single line we'd welcome, but not a double. An additional clarification to my earlier objection to the planned double yellow lines from Medlows to across 19a (my house); I was informed by Councillor Wren that a justification given was to maintain a clear 10m round the Medlows junction. I've just measured the proposed extra double yellow distance and it's an extra 34 metres from where the line currently ends. This should be seen as excessive I trust. In addition to my requested reduction I have also been speaking to Mr Howden at 23 (the opposite side of Medlows). There are no plans to extend the double yellow lines past his house but he would welcome such a change, finding it hard at present to see clearly from his driveway when exiting. Perhaps an additional 3-5m on that side could be accommodated? I remain very keen that extra parking restrictions are put in place and are sorely needed. A single yellow line past 19a with time restrictions would be most welcome.</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the road layout and to ensure sightlines are maintained, the double yellow lines are required. Whilst a 10 metre guideline is provided, in some cases this has to be extended. We have to consider many factors such as, bends in the road, street furniture, junction design, volume of traffic, traffic direction etc. this is not a limited list of considerations but many factors will play a part. In this case it was considered appropriate to extend the lines to maintain the safety of traffic movements in addition to junction safety. However, I recognise that the issues are not a consistent one and can recommend amending the double yellows to 10 metres and extending the single yellow to meet them. I hope this meets with your requirements.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised with changes as explained under Council response.
5	Roundwood Park	<p>With respect to the above I wish to add my wholehearted support for the above proposal. We reside at 11 Roundwood Park, and have lived with dangerous driving and parking for years on Roundwood Park and this couldn't come too soon. It is not just a case of inconvenience (though that happens almost daily) but the dangerous and entitled driving I have witnessed on this street is unbelievable. This is in the main caused by poor parking, which results in cars and coaches pavement driving, and I have also seen pavement driving going round the blind corner! (Including coaches). The recent installation of the all-weather pitches at Roundwood Park school has made this problem worse too, with substantial traffic and parking continuing until 10pm. I know there is some resistance on the street with respect to some of the double yellow markings to the north of the street however this is short-sighted as I think if parking is rightly restricted at the south end, the north end will soon be complaining about inconsiderate and dangerous parking. I would also note that every single residence on this street has a garage or garages, and driveway parking. See below some photos of typical parking outside our house (these are parked cars, not just waiting, and are during the days not just at school pick up /drop off times).</p>	Support noted	N/A	Make order with amendments as presented in final report
6	Roundwood Park	<p>With reference to the proposal ref. Yel1-2022, to make an Order to introduce various stopping and waiting restrictions across the District (specifically along Roundwood Park, Harpenden), I would like to state my strong objection to some of the proposals put forward. As the owner and occupant of 49 Roundwood Park (located directly opposite the junction with How Fields), for 35+ years, I strongly object to the proposal to add double-yellow lines with 'No waiting at any time' signage at the junction of Roundwood Park – How Fields as shown on Street Plan ref. YEL1-02/2022 (marked-up copy attached). The main reasons for my objection are as follows: 1.The purpose of the proposals is to improve the flow of traffic and prevent vehicles from parking during peak times which is predominantly an issue during school drop-off and collection hours. However, the junction of Roundwood Park – How Fields is located at the other end of the Roundwood Park so I fail to see how a small, isolated permanent 'No Waiting' zone goes any way to supporting the purpose of the proposal. 2.The area of Roundwood Park that is the main contributor to the issue will only become a temporary 'No Stopping' zone during specified hours with single-yellow lines; yet the road outside my property at the other end of Roundwood Park will become a permanent 'No Waiting' zone! 3.The proposed double-yellow lines span the full width of my property meaning that vehicles will no longer be able to stop or park outside the property at any time. The fact that my property has a driveway is irrelevant in this matter as the road outside is frequently used by workmen, service people (i.e.. builders, cleaners etc) as well as family and friends who come to visit. Whilst I fully support the purpose of the proposals in general along Roundwood Park, I feel that adding single-yellow lines with a temporary 'No Waiting' zone between 8:00-9:00am and 2:00-3:30pm Monday-Friday would be a much fairer and acceptable solution at the junction of Roundwood Park – How Fields. I hope that you will give my objection and suggestion serious consideration as I believe it is somewhat unjust that access to my property should be so adversely affected given the location of it in relation to the school which is the main cause of the issue. I would welcome any feedback or comments from yourselves via email on this matter should you wish to discuss it further.</p>	<p>Following a review, The Council has agreed to remove the proposal for double yellow lines at and opposite the junction with How Fields. However, the council will monitor traffic behaviour to ensure the junction remains safe and accessible.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised with changes as explained under Council response.
7	Roundwood Park	<p>We note that the map does not take account of the division of the 'old' no 13 into two houses, the 'new' no 13 and next to it, Park View House; but are able to see what is proposed in relation to the 'new' no 13.. Given the problems we have observed over that time, we strongly support the restrictions proposed immediately outside the current 13 Roundwood Park - a single line to the right of the entrance and double lines to the left as you face the house. First, we have suffered repeatedly from 'inappropriate and inconsiderate parking' outside our own property. Some days this happens around school opening/closing times, but on others a car may be parked across our entrance for the whole school day, given our close proximity to the school entrance which is only 2 houses away. Second, when cars are parked on both sides of our entrance, we have very poor visibility pulling out from our drive onto the road. Thus the 'No Stopping' section proposed between us and number 11 will greatly 'improve visibility at the property entrance', while the single line to the right of entrance will improve it somewhat given the limited hours when cars can be parked. Improving visibility in this way as we exit from our entrance will reduce the chance of a crash due to poor visibility and thus 'improve road safety'. For this reason, we would like double lines on both sides of the entrance, rather than just on the left hand side. We support the 'No stopping' restrictions around the school entrance. We have witnessed many potential accidents with buses and cars dropping off and pulling out again. Zigzags are ignored. Finally, we underline the need for the new restrictions to be enforced by traffic officers if they are to succeed.</p>	<p>At this stage we are unable to extend double yellow lines as requested, this change would not meet the minimal variants allowed. However, we can review this once the proposed restrictions are implemented.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised

8	Roundwood Park	<p>We object to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines outside 47A and 49 Roundwood Park and on the opposite side of the road on the corners of How Field.</p> <p>This restrictive proposal is completely unnecessary. Traffic flows outside our house are light throughout nearly the whole day and parking outside is normally minimal and safe. There is no history of accidents or near misses to justify the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>Traffic flows only increase at school drop-off and collection times in term time but we are so far from the school that this does not affect us. In any case, the proposed restrictions are unassociated with school traffic as they would apply all the time.</p> <p>The prevention of parking outside our houses would simply displace our visitors' and delivery vehicles to outside our neighbours houses unnecessarily and would aggravate traffic flow.</p>	<p>Following a review, The Council has agreed to remove the proposal for double yellow lines at and opposite the junction with How Fields. However, the council will monitor traffic behaviour to ensure the junction remains safe and accessible.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised with changes as explained under Council response.
9	Roundwood Park	<p>We live at Roundwood Lane, Harpenden, and have been residents there for more than 30 years. Our property is situated, completely, within the section of Roundwood Lane that is referred to within the Restriction of Stopping and Waiting Order, ref Yel1-2022, Schedule 3, Number 7 (Roundwood Lane). We are writing to object to the proposed implementation of Schedule 3, Number 7 (Roundwood Lane) of the Restriction of Stopping and Waiting Order (Yel1-2022). We set out our reasons for objection, below:</p> <p>1.As we reside within the area specified in Schedule 3, Number 7 of the Order (Yel1-2022) we are well qualified to provide St Albans District Council Parking Development department with our knowledge about actual vehicle parking within this area of Roundwood Lane. We can categorically state that there are never any vehicles parked on the road in the area that we have marked IN RED on the plan shown below. Furthermore, there are never any vehicles parked outside our property at 38 Roundwood Lane, or outside the properties at 59 and 61 Roundwood Lane. Based on this knowledge, it means that the imposition of double yellow lines as per schedule 3, number 7 is completely unnecessary, making it a waste of public funds in addition to creating an unnecessary eyesore.</p> <p>2.Since there are never any parked vehicles in the area shown in red, the imposition of double yellow lines will have zero positive impact on road safety; it will not assist the movement of traffic and/or pedestrians; it most certainly will not improve the amenity of the road and its immediate surroundings. It will have a negligible effect on inappropriate, or inconsiderate parking – because in the area marked in red, there is none. It will not improve visibility at the junction of Roundwood Park and Roundwood Lane – for vehicles exiting Roundwood Park, nor with the property entrances.</p> <p>3.The part of Roundwood Lane that is subject to Schedule 3, Number 7 of the above order has hitherto retained its semi-rural feel and appearance. The introduction of double yellow lines in this area will destroy this and result in the ever-increasing urbanisation of the road, thus destroying the look and feel of the environment – and for no practical, or discernible improvement to road safety.</p> <p>4.The Restriction of Stopping and Waiting Order published states that residents have been consulted, yet there has been no direct consultation with us, even though we reside completely within the proposed zone for the double yellow lines.</p> <p>5.However, we do not object to the implementation of double yellow lines on both sides of Roundwood Park – as shown in the plan. The Council is correct to focus on this area, as we do see traffic "difficulties" mainly at school opening and closing times in this area, combined with occasional users of the Royal Mail letterbox, inappropriately stopping on the eastern side of Roundwood Park. However, we would request that the proposed parking restrictions be limited to specific times of the day, corresponding to the school opening and closing times. Please would you now consider our objections and take into account our extensive knowledge about the actual situation in the proposed zone for double yellow lines.</p>	<p>Following comments from other residents and Councillors, we recognise the need to protect this junction from parking. We appreciate that the yellow lines can be unsightly in some cases and we will do what we can to ensure the lines and paint used are sympathetic to the area. However, we must ensure that the junction is protected regardless of any previous incidents or not.</p>	Not resolved	Make Order as advertised
10	Roundwood Park	<p>I have lived at this property since 2005. I have not in all this time experienced any problems with school parking at this end of Roundwood Park (the Roundwood Lane end). I do not understand the rationale of putting double yellow lines outside my house and object to this on the basis that it will make life difficult for visitors to my property. I have 2 adult children who work and so this household fills the driveway leaving no space for visitors. Furthermore, you intend to put double yellow lines at the entrance to Howfield, a very quiet cul de sac again with no school traffic as parents are not prepared to walk that far. I would ask that you bear in mind that we are a corner plot and side front onto Howfield for quite some way (approximately 30 Metres). I strongly object to you yellow lining all this area as again it would impact significantly on this household and their visitors for no justifiable reason.</p>	<p>Following a review, The Council has agreed to remove the proposal for double yellow lines at and opposite the junction with How Fields. However, the council will monitor traffic behaviour to ensure the junction remains safe and accessible.</p>	Partially resolved	Make Order as advertised with changes as explained under Council response.
11	Roundwood Park	<p>As a resident at 11 Roundwood Park I am writing to give my wholehearted support to the traffic management proposals for Roundwood Park, which are long overdue and very necessary. Apart from the disruption and inconvenience of vehicles blocking the driveways of residents and traffic jams caused by school traffic, vehicles mounting the pavements are a constant danger to pedestrians many of which are children attending the Roundwood Park schools.</p> <p>The proposals cannot be installed soon enough for the safety and benefit of both the residents and school users.</p>	<p>Support recorded thank you</p>	N/A	Make Order as advertised
12	Roundwood Park	<p>I am the joint owner/ occupier for the address below</p> <p>I wish to object to this proposal in its entirety. The main reason for this is that the current parking arrangements in place are perfectly adequate and safe and have been since I moved here in 2006. I have 5 children who have walked to the schools from our home daily for the last 10 years or so. 4 of them still do so. If it wasn't perfectly safe I would have raised this with the council. I know that there is congestion around the Roundwood schools and the end and beginning of the school day but the existing arrangements are perfectly adequate in dealing with this. I walk past the school 2 to 3 times during the week between 7.45 and 8.40 so I see this with own eyes.</p> <p>There has been no change or increase in congestion so I don't understand why these proposals have been raised now. The level of congestion is unchanged since I have been here. Residents who live near the school are in no position to complain about congestion. When they moved into their houses they know (or should have known) that a schools are there and that there is congestion at these times. They have benefitted by being close the schools – many of children have attended them. As far proposal will simply move the congestion to areas further away from the school.</p> <p>All in all I don't see any justification of this and it is not a sensible use of tax payers money.</p>	<p>Residents in the area including the school themselves have raised concerns about parking around the school pick up and drop off times. When we visited the area on various occasions we also recorded significant safety concerns. With this in mind we must act to protect road safety around the school for all road users including pedestrians.</p>	Not resolved	Make Order as advertised